



MEETING NOTES

Regional Plan 2012 – Working Group for Circulation & Bicycle Element

Thursday, February 23, 2012

3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Flagstaff City Hall, Staff Conference Room

CAC Members:

1. Julie Leid
2. Nat White
3. Ben Anderson
4. Mike Nesbitt

Contributing Staff and General Public

1. Darrel Barker, Comprehensive Planning Project Manager
2. Bob Caravona, Advance Planning Manager
3. Kim Sharp, Neighborhood Planner
4. Dave Wessel, FMPO Manager
5. Martin Ince, Multi-modal Planner
6. Kate Morley, Coconino County Planner
7. Brian Foley, FMPO and City of Flagstaff Intern
8. Rick Miller, General Public and Conservation Study Forum

Meeting commences: 3:35 p.m.

Darrel Barker, Comprehensive Planning Project Manager leads meeting discussion.

1. **Revised Goals and Policies:** Darrel Barker opens the meeting by explaining that comments/notes that have been received on the goals and policies, in addition to revisions that have been made, are shown in track changes in the current document. “Safety” is then introduced for discussion as a new goal heading, having one goal and two policies.
2. **Safety**
 - a. Kate Morley commented that we should re-word the safety goal. Group discussion followed, with consensus that the terms “frequency, severity and hazards” would be included. Full revisions can be seen in the goals and policies document.
 - b. Kate asked what “encouragement” refers to in safety policy T2.1, and whether it applies to safety or education. Martin and Erika stated that it does apply to safety. Kate stated

that we need additional detail in the policy statement as to what “encouragement” means. Dave responded that he did not agree and that the policies needed to remain concise, with additional detail being provided in the text. Darrel agreed with Dave, and further stated that it is probably not necessary, considering the context of the subject element and text, to include greater detail within policy statements. Doing so would result in very long, wordy policy statements which are not appropriate in a regional plan. Nat stated that an introduction paragraph should be included for each goal segment in the text leading up to the goals and policies section of the document, where a more detailed explanation of each goal/policy segment would be provided. Ben asked if we were referring to “best practices” in relation to the context of the goals and policies. Dave stated that the introductory text of the document will set up the context of the goals and policies. Erika recommended reviewing Boulder County Colorado’s regional plan, as it is structured nicely and contains great imagery. Julie stated that we need to include quality imagery in addition to the text, and that this will be very important in conveying our message.

- c. Nat stated that policy T2.2 should be inclusive rather than focused and that tourist should also be included as vulnerable travelers. Dave commented on universal access, and that if we make it safe for our most vulnerable travelers, everyone will then be safe. After a general group discussion, it was agreed that policy T2.2 would be re-worded. Julie stated that we need to provide safety programs to protect our most vulnerable travelers. Dave stated that the safety segment is intended to be overarching to the entire element, and that safety is mentioned many times throughout the other goals and policies of the document. It is therefore not necessary to mention every mode of travel specifically within the safety segment.

3. Rail Freight and Transit

- a. Erika suggested changing the title of the segment to “Rail Freight and Passenger Rail”, with the group agreeing. In response to a question in track changes, Kate stated that we do need a policy on intermodal connectivity. Dave stated that there are often politics involved with this particular mode, and that we need to be careful with our goal/policy language. Ben stated that policy T9.2 needs to include “intermodal connectivity”. Rick questioned policy T9.3, and how this policy would interact with city/county government. Dave commented that it would apply to a rail yard or port authority that may be possible in the future, but that it was not likely that the city/county would build such facilities. Rick stated that it would be better to say “cooperate with R.R.”. A general group discussion followed concerning area businesses which currently have railroad spurs. The group discussed whether we need policy T9.3, as it seems to be covered in T9.1. The group agreed that policy T9.3 should be removed, and further agreed that a policy concerning intermodal connectivity should be drafted.
- b. Nat commented that we should make policy T9.1 the goal, and possibly make the goal a policy. The group agreed that this policy should become the new goal, with the addition of “and travelers” at the end.

4. Air Service

- a. Erika asked whether our airport is solely for passenger service, or if it is also for recreation. Nat stated that recreation is important as well as emergency use. Ben commented that we should make the goal a policy, and should re-write the goal. A group discussion followed over the necessity to draft a more encompassing goal. The potential

for more air freight in the region was also discussed. It was agreed that we should re-write a more general goal and add more policies to elaborate. A discussion followed as to whether we should include a policy concerning surrounding land use, and whether we should protect the airport by ensuring that adjacent land uses are compatible. Julie commented that we should stick to “air” as transportation. Dave stated that we should let “Economic Development” and “Land Use” address other concerns related to the airport. Kate commented that we should include a policy dedicated to passenger service.

- b. Rick asked whether policy T10.1 referred to economic or infrastructure. Julie commented that such a policy should be left to economic development. Rick stated that the policy doesn’t belong here, and the group agreed that it should be removed. Martin commented that we should include a goal that addresses transportation to and from the airport.

5. FUTS, Environmental Considerations

- a. Nat commented that some of the policies under environmental considerations are more economic as written and that economic and environmental policies are not contradictory. If the policies belong here, they should be re-written to imply their non-exclusiveness. Kate asked if the mention of transportation investments implied economic or infrastructure. A group discussion ensued on goal T3, with the consensus being that this is generally a difficult/tricky section.
- b. Julie expressed concern that there needs to be a balance between environmental considerations and growth. Very strict environmental goals and policies could make future growth extremely difficult. Kate commented that we need the goals and policies, but that we do need a balance and need to build responsibly. Nat stated that we need a better goal statement to replace T3. Rick commented that we need to strike a balance between needs and environmental considerations with each individual project. The group agreed that we need to relate context to environmental considerations, and suggested using new language including terms such as “adverse impacts” and “mitigate”. It was also agreed that this section needed to be re-written.

6. Meeting Conclusion

- a. Darrel stated that all comments and ideas from the working group would be greatly appreciated by Wednesday, February 29, especially concerning the environmental considerations. It was further stated that the next packet would likely be limited to further revisions of the goals and policies.

Meeting adjourns at 5:00 p.m.